

**From:** [Fowler, Amy](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Nelson, Laura](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback on the Proposed MLS  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 5:01:10 PM  
**Attachments:** [EnglishLanguageArts-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00001.htm](#)  
[Mathematics-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00002.htm](#)  
[Science-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00003.htm](#)  
[SocialStudies-FeedbackonProposedMLS.pdf](#)  
[ATT00004.htm](#)

---

I have attached the feedback from the teachers of my school district. I appreciate all of the time that has been put in by all four work groups. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

**English Language Arts**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

English Language Arts K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Foundations	K - 2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa Kdg Should read recognize and name rather than identifying.
		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Ac Kdg Should read follow words from left to right not understand.
		1	1	3	1	1	1	1	RF1Aa 1st Should read recognize and name not

								identify.
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ad 1st move this standard to kdg.
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ae 1st and Kdg not just 1st
		3	1	1	1	1	1	RF1Ag 1st move to Kdg not 1st
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF2Ae Kdg should read CVC words not simple words
		1	3	1	1	1	1	RF2Af,g,h should be reorganized. Put g first, then h, then f
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF2Ag 1st should read medial vowel.
		1	3	1	1	3	1	RF3Ac Kdg provide dolch word list of 50 words
		1	3	1	1	3	1	RF3Am 1st provide dolch words list of 220 words
		4	4	4	4	4	4	RF3An 1st need to list reading strategies. Look at the picture. Reread. Read around and go back, Try both vowel sounds...
		1	1	1	1	3	1	RF3Ai 2nd What is grade

									appropriate?
		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	RF4A 1st and 2nd Provide a list of reading strategies
	3 - 5	3	4	3	2	2	2	1	RF3A 3rd-5th add a list of grade appropriate high frequency words, not coherent in the skills, the skills are in isolation and do not build upon each other
Reading	K - 2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1A Kdg should include RI.K.6 from current MLS Need an awareness of author and illustrator (define and identify)
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R1B 1st should include L.1.4 c from current MLS
		3	3	3	1	1	1	1	R2C 1st a. needs to be moved to kindergarten
	3 - 5	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	R1A 3rd- e. Keep R1C-Take out, does not need whole standard, put connections with comprehension strategies,

									<p>R1D4-5th-Needs clarification on rigor expected at each grade level. How do teachers go deeper each year?</p> <p>R2A3rd-d.say summarize, not paraphrase, f. take out!</p> <p>R2A4th-d-h-Take ALL out, need to concentrate on comprehension at this level, let kids choose fiction and nonfiction books without tying into a specific topic or genre, keep wording from R.I 5.6, Take out R2B, Move R3Bc. to 2nd grade, R3B5thb. be more specific use RI5.6 explanation, R#Ca. 3rd- DOK level 1, change to identify and explain, R3Cb. More explanation needed for compare and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

									contrast, R3Cc. add using textual evidence, R3C 4th-Use wording of RI4.1, b. take out, confusing, c. use wording from RI4.8, R3C 5th-add RI.5.1and RI 5.8, R4-Do not scaffold in a stair step approach to each grade level, Add RI3.5, RF3A 3rd-5th, add list of grade specific high frequency words per grade level.
Writing	K - 2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	W1Aa 1st Include using graphic organizer.
	3 - 5	4	3	2	2	3	2	3	The research strand is not developmentally appropriate. Don't change the language and standards from the current standards.
Speaking & Listening	K - 2	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	SL1A Kdg Should still include continue a conversation through multiple exchanges.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 1st should

									include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL1A 2nd Should include b. & c. from current MLS
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL2A 1st & 2nd should include apply skill to TEXTS.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL3A Kdg & 1st & 2nd should include requesting clarification if something is not understood.
		3	1	1	3	1	1	1	SL4A Kdg add speak audibly and express thoughts, feelings, and ideas clearly.
	3 - 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Language	K - 2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1A 2nd a. Need to include introduce cursive but not master
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B Kdg f. Need to include the list of appropriate sight words.
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 1st e. Need to include the list of appropriate

									sight words.
		3	3	3	3	1	1	1	L1B 2nd d. & e. move to 1st grade
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1B 2nd g. & i. define grade appropriate
		3	3	3	3	3	1	1	L1A 1st a. Need to include current MLS print ALL Upper & Lowercase letters
	3 - 5	4	3	3	1	2	4	3	L1Aa. 3rd-Take cursive out or move to second grade. L1A 5th-change to demonstrate and apply, L1B 3rd-d, c, j. move back to second grade L1B4th-a. commas in series and commas with yes and no, move to 3rd,



Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

English Language Arts 6-12									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Reading Literary Texts	O M S	1	3 - RL6 This does not seem to build on each other. RL 7 Word Choice in 7th grade to signify tone does correlate with 6th grade sound device to create meaning.	2	3 - RL 5 - this seems very difficult to assess the validity of this. More guidance is needed. RL11 How can this be assessed?	3 RL4.7 - distinct (this would need to be defined) RL3 - what are visual elements? RL6 Is this point of view or viewpoint?	1	1	Need a glossary of terms (not open for interpretation) including literary devices, point of view vs. viewpoint, cite
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Language seems to match ACT language better: example "synthesize"

<b>Reading Informational Texts</b>	O M S	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	How would #11 be accessed? We need a glossary of terms and definitions.
	O H S	1	1	2 - The trend with testing nonfiction would seem to demand some additional rigor in this area	1	1	1	1	
<b>Writing &amp; Researching</b>	O M S	2- Students don't grasp the basic grammar	1	2 - The rigor is weak in 6th grade if students do not have to look at compound and complex sentences. This will affect their writing.	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	2- Students don't grasp the basic grammar	1	2 - The rigor is weak in 6th grade if students do not have to look at compound and complex sentences. This will affect their writing.	1	1	1	1	
<b>Speaking &amp; Listening</b>	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Leveling of the multimedia is a plus. Skills are easy to understand and can be assessed.
	O	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

November, 2015  
School of the Osage

	H S								
--	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mathematics**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>  Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	<b>2</b>  Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	<b>3</b>  Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	<b>4</b>  Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
--	--	--	--

Mathematics K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent</u> path through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness</u> upon graduation.	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass</u> the breadth of the content.	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Number Sense (K-1)	K								
	1								
Number Sense & Operations in Base Ten	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3.NBT.A.2-through 10,000 instead of 100,000 3.NBT.A.3-What is

									efficiency-clarify with specific problems and amount of time
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Questionable especially to parents
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Number Sense &amp; Operations in Fractions</b>	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.NF.A.1-4-The verb "understand" is vague-How do you assess "understand"? We also would like to make sure that our fractions do not go over 1 on a number line.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	The language clarity is much improved for both teachers and parents.
	5	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	The verbs used to assess are very broad and

									not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
Relationships & Algebraic Thinking	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	3.RA.A.1-The verb "interpret" is unclear. A more specific description would be helpful 3.RA.B.1-They are not developmentally ready for distributive property. 3.RA.D.1-possibly change to a two-step addition and subtraction and one-step multiplication and division (With us just learning multiplication at this level and the keywords that go with it, it would be nice to start with a smaller foundation of solving

									multiplication/division word problems)
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Geometry &amp; Measurement</b>	K								
	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.GM.A.1-2-Not a real life skill. Tiling an area is an unlikely strategy to use when finding area. Would like to see it piggyback off of our multiplication and just work on length times width. 3.GM.C.3-Take completely out for same reason

									as above. 3.GM.D.2-Clarify what the verb "understand" means There is no working with money that shows up in any standards. 2nd grade covers counting money/4th grade covers solving problems with money...but there is no work with money at our level. We would hate for them to lose this skill by not working with it.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	For parents, when examples are provided, parents will have a better understanding of the standard.
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.
<b>Data &amp; Statistics</b>	K								



November, 2015  
 School of the Osage

	1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Line plots are nice for interpreting, but creating a line plot is an unrealistic skill.
	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Much improved
	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	The verbs used to assess are very broad and not specific to what the students will be asked to do on state assessments.

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>  Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	<b>2</b>  Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	<b>3</b>  Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	<b>4</b>  Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
--	--	--	--

Mathematics 6-8								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Ratios & Proportional Relationships (RP)	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	

					education.			
<b>Number Sense &amp; Operations (NS)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	It was very helpful to have some examples written with the standards. We believe students are more developmentally ready to understand integers in grades 3-5 than fraction and decimals along with their operations. Fractions and decimals could be more easily implemented at the middle grade level while teaching ratios and proportional relationships. We propose delaying teaching fractions and decimals to the middle grades and replace with integers.
<b>Expressions, Equations &amp; Inequalities (EEI)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be	1	It would be helpful to know what standards are the priority standards and what are the supporting standards, so

					for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		we would not have to look at two different documents. Having all the information in one document would create a more seamless understanding.
<b>Geometry &amp; Measurement (GM)</b>	1	3 - Angles and angle relationships are taught heavily in 3rd and 4th grade, and are not addressed again until 7th grade. The students are not retaining the information because they are not seeing/reviewing the concepts consistently every year.	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	
<b>Data Analysis, Statistics &amp; Probability (DSP)</b>	3 - 6th Grade students are not developmentally ready to understand much of what is taught in this strand at 6th grade. They can follow the methodical process to solve statistical	3 -The heart of statistics is covered in 6th grade. This is too much with all the other skills that need to be covered in 6th grade. Possible solution - teach statistics in	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th	1	

November, 2015

School of the Osage

	questions and create box plots, but they do not understand the analysis and interpretation of what they are creating/doing.	both 6th and 7th grade, and probability in 8th grade.			who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.		
<b>Functions (F)</b>	1	1	1	1	2 - It would be very helpful to have clear/specific examples integrated into the standards for clarification for teachers as well as parents and other stakeholders who may not understand or comprehend the standards as well as those in the field of education.	3 - Standards help a student be college ready, but do not take into account students who need to be career ready. Standards and curriculum beyond 8th grade math are not applicable to students who are choosing to enter careers right out of HS.	1	

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<p><b>1</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</p>	<p><b>3</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</p>
---	---	---	---

Mathematics 9-12								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Algebra								
Functions								
Data								
Geometry								

**Science**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>  Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	<b>2</b>  Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	<b>3</b>  Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	<b>4</b>  Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels
--	--	--	--

Science K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path through and across all grade levels</u> .	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations for students at each grade level</u> .	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (PS1)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	2 - perhaps define "illustrate" in 1st grade objective, or use a different word	1	1	
	2	1	1	1 - conduct an investigation, analyze data	1	2 - maybe add an example to PS1-A for 2nd grade	1	1	took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard
	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	3	Use current standards. Not covered in other grade levels.

	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	2	3	4		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model?
<b>Motion &amp; Stability; Forces &amp; Interactions (PS2)</b>	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	2 - no standard on magnetism until 3rd grade, used to be a big standard in 2nd grade	1	1	2 - again took a lot of standards and compiled them into 1 broader standard without examples	1	1	Only thing I see in 2nd grade that has to do with magnets is sorting...
	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	2	2	3	3	3		3 - Very simple	What exactly is the expectation of an argument?
<b>Energy (PS3)</b>	K - 1	N/A							
	2								
	3								
	4	3	4 - Where are the units-there are just fragments of units scattered throughout	1	2	2	1	1	
	5	2	2	PS3-B not rigorous PS3C is rigorous	3	3		3	What are the expectations of a model? Are formulas required?
<b>Waves &amp; Applications</b>	K -	1	3 - PS4-A is the same objective	1	3 - include examples of how	1	1	1	



<b>in Technology for Information Transfers (PS4)</b>	1		in kindergarten and 1st grade		to assess this strand				
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - add examples??	1	1	same as before - lots of specific standard combined into 1 broader standard
	3								
	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	What exactly is the expectation of a model? Very vague!
<b>From Molecules to Organisms: Structure &amp; Process (LS1)</b>	K - 1	4 - 1st grade's objectives are very difficult to understand which makes all of these areas difficult to judge	4	4	4	4	4	4	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	no change
	3	1	4	2	1	2	1	2	Not covered in other grades. Needs to be more specific for types of animals being compared.
	4	4	4	1	3	2	2	1	
	5	2	4 - Vertebrate/Invertebrate?????	1	3	2		2	Needs to say skeletal. What is the expectation for an argument!
<b>Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, &amp; Dynamics (LS2)</b>	K - 1								
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	only change is the addition of

									dispersing seeds or pollinating plants
	3								
	4								
	5	2	2	2	2	3		2	What is the expectation of a model?
<b>Heredity &amp; Inheritance: Variation of Traits (LS3)</b>	K - 1	2	3 - too big of a gap between 1st grade and 3rd grade. Not addressed in 2nd.	1	1	3 - please add examples to the 3rd grade students	1	1	
	2								
	3	4	3	1	3	3	2	3	Need clarification of standard
	4								
	5								
<b>Biological Evolution: Unity &amp; Diversity (LS4)</b>	K - 1								
	2								
	3	4	3	1	3	3	2	3	Not covered in other grades. Argument, mates, and making a claim on merit is not appropriate for third grade and should be moved to a higher grade.
	4								
	5								Descriptors are

									needed for expectations. Unified vocabulary of terms and their meanings. Where is the engineering and technology? Unwrapping the standard will not be consist through grade levels in district and out of the district.
Earth's Place in the Universe (ESS1)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	2 - explain "Earth events"	1	1	like this wording much better
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	Argument and what is expected of a graphical display?
Earth's Systems (ESS2)	K - 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	added standards dealing with preventing erosion and where water can be found on Earth
	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	Move to a lower grade.

	4	4	3	1	4 - only through observation	1	1	1	
	5	1	1	1	1	1		1	
Earth & Human Activity (ESS3)	K - 1								This is only addressed in kindergarten. It may be problematic for the sustainability of our environment to not have this addressed again.
	2								removed how humans use rocks and soil
	3								
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	3	3	3	3	3			What does the term science ideas mean?

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

Science 6-8								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (MS-PS1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Motion & Stability; Forces & Interactions (MS-PS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Energy (MS-PS3)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Waves & Applications in Technology for Information Transfers	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

<b>(MS-PS4)</b>								
<b>From Molecules to Organisms: Structure &amp; Process (MS-LS1)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, &amp; Dynamics (MS-LS2)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Heredity &amp; Inheritance: Variation of Traits (MS-LS3)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Biological Evolution: Unity &amp; Diversity (MS-LS4)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Earth's Place in the Universe (MS-ESS1)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Earth's Systems (MS-ESS2)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Earth &amp; Human Activity (MS-ESS3)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<p><b>1</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</p>	<p><b>3</b></p> <p>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</p>
---	---	---	---

Science 9-12								
Strand	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous</u> path of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Matter & Its Interactions (HS-PS1)	2 - see overall comments	1	1	1	1	1	1	HS PS1-4: too high of a level for physical science
Motion & Stability; Forces & Interactions (HS-PS2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Will students be able to use calculators on the state assessment?
Energy (HS-PS3)	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	HS PS3-1: do not understand what students are suppose to know
Waves & Applications in Technology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

for Information Transfers (HS-PS4)								
<b>From Molecules to Organisms: Structure &amp; Process (HS-LS1)</b>	1 - We feel that teaching cellular organelles in the MS is not developmentally appropriate. An introduction to this suitable but mastery is not developmentally appropriate in the MS.	3 - there are gaps in content between MS and HS	1	1	3 - HS-LS2 is not clear	1	1	HS-LS1 covers content that will need reinforcement by high school teachers (specifically with cellular organelles and cell transport)
<b>Ecosystems: Interactions, Energy, &amp; Dynamics (HS-LS2)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Heredity &amp; Inheritance: Variation of Traits (HS-LS3)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Biological Evolution: Unity &amp; Diversity (HS-LS4)</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Translation is good
<b>Earth's Place in the Universe (HS-ESS1)</b>								
<b>Earth's Systems (HS-ESS2)</b>								
<b>Earth &amp;</b>								



November, 2015  
School of the Osage

Human Activity (HS-ESS3)								
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Social Studies**  
**Feedback on Proposed MLS**

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

<b>1</b>  <b>Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.</b>	<b>2</b>  <b>Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.</b>	<b>3</b>  <b>Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.</b>	<b>4</b>  <b>Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels</b>
---	---	---	---

Social Studies K-5									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent</u> path through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path of high expectations</u> for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom and/or on a state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
Document Shaping Constitutional Democracy	K - 2								
	3	4 - Seems VERY abstract when getting into state-level government	4 - Does build sequentially but not developmentally. 3rd grade was to be state focused but when comparing/contrasting to the national	4 - because of the abstract nature, this seem too rigorous	4 - This is not project based, rather constructed response.	4 - Too general/broad, not sure which areas of the topic to cover from one grade level to the next	4 - Does seem to be rigorous but, again, very deep for the third grade level	According to whom or what?	The number of standards needed to be covered have been overwhelmingly increased

			level it is necessary to teach both in order to truly have the understanding for comparing/contrasting.						
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding.	1	3 - too complex for parents and stakeholders	1	4 - these concepts go way too deep. (ie. inalienable rights, redress of grievances)	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Some of these seem like they might be hard to assess. I am also concerned that some standards are a bit vague or broad for parents
<b>Governance Systems</b>	K - 2								
	3	4	4	4 - too rigorous	4	4 - GS.2.D.3 can be understood. The others are very difficult to comprehend.	4	?	
	4	4	4	4 - outside the realm of their cognitive understanding	4 - cannot assess	4 - standards are way too broad	3	3	
	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	Confused of analyzing peaceful

									resolution of disputes of courts. Also confused on what you mean by authoritative decisions.
History	K - 2								
	3	2	2	1	1	1	1		
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	I like the history part of the standards. Easy to understand.
Economics	K - 2								
	3	4 - E.4.C.3.a down through E.4.D.3. These seem to be very abstract for 3rd graders.	2	4 - stated on number 1.	2	4 - due to the last few already mentioned. (tax generation, cost analysis benefit)	3		
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
Geographic Study	K - 2								
	3	2 - EG.5.C.3.b: Way too broad	3	2	4 - (EG.5.C.3.b)	2	2		
	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	The geography is too broad for a 4th grader.
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
People,	K								

<b>Groups, &amp; Cultures</b>	- 2								
	3	4 - Too broad and hits beyond Missouri history.	4	4	4	4 - This strand is overwhelming and encompasses many ideas and makes it difficult to know how to go about teaching the concepts. Can't really pinpoint the important parts of the broad concepts to teach.	4		
	4	4	4 - standards do not follow a coherent path through 4th grade	2	4	4 - too difficult, standard do not make sense	4	3	
	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Tools of Social Science Inquiry</b>	K - 2								
	3	4 - TS.7.A.3.a-Primary vs Secondary sources are too abstract for third graders.	4	4	4	4 - (TS.7.A.3.a is too abstract)	4		
	4	4	4	2	4	4 - stakeholders will not understand standards	3	4	
	5	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	My only concern with the changes to the standards

									is not having the materials to teach it and time to teach it all. I love the time period and content, but worry about fitting it all in and finding necessary resources.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Please use the following scale to provide feedback & provide any suggested revisions for standards:

1	2	3	4
Standards are acceptable as is. Overall the standards are listed at the appropriate grade level.	Standards are acceptable, edits would improve, but are not mandatory. Very few (minor) issues.	Standards are acceptable <i>after</i> they are revised as suggested immediately below.	Standards require complete rewrite. Majority of standards are at <i>inappropriate</i> grade levels

Social Studies 6-12									
Strand	G R A D E	1. The standards in this strand are <u>developmentally appropriate</u> .	2. The standards in this strand follow a <u>coherent path</u> through and across all grade levels.	3. The standards set a <u>rigorous path</u> of high expectations for students at each grade level.	4. The majority of the standards in this strand can be <u>assessed in the classroom</u> and/or on a <u>state assessment</u> .	5. The standards in this strand are <u>understandable</u> to educators and explainable to parents and other stakeholders.	6. The standards in this strand represent the necessary content for a student to reach <u>college and/or career readiness upon graduation</u> .	7. The standards in this strand are <u>accurate and encompass the breadth of the content</u> .	Overall comments regarding the proposed standards:
History: Continuity & Change	O M S	1	1	1	1	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	At times, wording is nonspecific
	O H S	1	1	1	1	2 - Clarification may be need to explain these standards to stakeholders.	1	1	
Government Systems & Principles	O M S	1	1	1	2 - concern that some of the objectives are broad-how will new teachers know the specifics for testing; or the consistency of	2 - could be more specific and measurable	1	1	

					teachers across the board				
	O H S	2-Except T3S2B Standard B which requires mastery of both Articles of Confederation and the Constitution in order to compare to ideals present in the Declaration of Independence. This could be done at a basic level with some sophomores and a more advanced level with others.	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Geographical Study</b>	O M S	1	1	1	2 - again some non-specific language for the US History	2 - language non-specific	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	These standards are most applicable in chapters that examine voting practices and representation (apportionment, gerrymandering)
<b>Economic Concepts</b>	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	More clarification is needed on standard T1S4A in order to



									properly teach content. Does this strand refer to opportunity cost in campaign finance, the federal budget, local budgets, interest group treasuries?
People, Groups, & Cultures	O M S	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	O H S	1	1	1	1	1	1		

**From:** [Brown, Brian](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Comments from Knox County High School Teachers  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2015 2:33:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [Comments on HB1490 workgroups.docx](#)

---

Please see attached document.

Thank you.

--

Brian Brown

**Principal**

**Knox County R-1 High School**

Comments on HB1490:

1. I think the variety of individuals to serve on the work groups will allow for a diverse range of opinion and viewpoints which will allow for the standards to be well-rounded.
2. Not necessarily a comment about the house bill or standards, but I think it would be beneficial to attend the public hearings about the revisions of the standards - would be a good PD opportunity and chance for continued ed.
3. As a vocational instructor that does not have a set standard represented in this HB and accompanying documents, I appreciate that the standards are broken into subsets that are easy for me to use to crosswalk with my current standards and curriculum. As I am writing new curriculum now it has made it fairly easy to transition some of the old into the new.
4. I do not see much difference in the standards that have been proposed and the pre-existing standards that will affect the choices I use for standards that fit in my curriculum, however in the data available to myself (crosswalks provided for certain courses through the DESE curriculum links) I have noticed they are vary subtle differences. For myself - this is handy and comforting while trying to re-write curriculum.

---

Proposed Standard -

RL.2.9-10 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings.

CCS-

RL.9- 10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).

I feel if this standard is broadened to what the proposed standard states students will miss out on the analyzing portion of figurative and connotative language. They will miss out of important conversations needed to help students understand how words can be used in multiple ways and how these uses can impact a text.

Proposed Standard-

RL.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

RI.11.9- 10 Analyze how multiple texts reflect the historical and/or cultural contexts.

I like that they have added these standards in. I personally already teach multiple texts over several historical events, however, I could see how other teachers may not hit multiple texts without this standard. It is vital to look at different point of views over one event and have discussions over how these pov's affect the readers.

Proposed Standard-

RI.10.9- 10 Evaluate how effectively two or more texts develop similar ideas/topics.

Current Standard-

RI.9- 10.9 Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms speech, King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail"), including how they address related themes and concepts.

I like how this standard has been broadened and allows the teacher to choose texts that our students can better relate too. I also like how the writing standards have been written. Several CCS standards have been combined, as well as the standard focusing on editing has been written with more detail.

- 
1. I noticed that there appears to be a shift from memorization and rote learning to more hands-on and creative learning.

2. There are less standards here than were on the old CLE's.
  3. It appears they have incorporated STEM components as well as interdisciplinary tie-ins.
- 

1. I am glad to see that government has its own standards and that we are no longer lumped in together with Language Arts.

2. I like the fact that a citizen's personal responsibility is part of the standards.

3. I also like the fact that having political differences are worked into the standards.

---

Overall I view the new learning standards as being too vague in terms of the materials we are to cover in secondary Language Arts classes.

Many of the proposed reading standards seem to leave the content to be instructed up to the teacher, which could create an issue with uniformity in the curricula.

The proposed writing standard (WR.2.11-12) does not emphasize the techniques we should encourage students to develop, rather condensing the standard down to a short grab-bag of potential techniques to cover or blend.

---

- 1) I think they are similar to the NEXT Generation Science Standards
  - 2) A lot of project based and creation of models
  - 3) Requires more higher level thinking
- 

The introductory statements for the themes are very informative and naturally break the standards into units unlike before where the standards would be used multiple times and have different meanings with each unit.

The possible sources of study that come with each theme is a great resource to find primary and secondary sources.

The proposed standards are the same as previous standards however the key concepts are much more detailed and easier to follow.

---

As I browsed the proposed standards, I did not find anything regarding the other courses that are offered which I believe play a big role in the education of students. In order for all to be "on the same page" I think it is crucial to also include elective classes like foreign language, P.E, art, etc.

From what I have seen, it looks like some of the previous standards are being simplified while others are getting added with so much information. That makes it confusing to understand what the actual expectation is.

Section 160.518. 2 states that "....assessment system shall only permit the academic performance of students in each school in the state to be tracked against prior academic performance in the same school. How will that work for students that transfer late in the school year?"

---

A1.NQ.A.1 - Language seems very specific as related to rational exponents and as compared to other domain standards. It is also a standard that is addressed in Algebra II. My concern is that these standards (A.1 and A.2) go beyond Algebra I.

A1.NQ.A.2 - Same as above.

Standards A1.CED.B.4 through B.7 - All contain concrete language that is readily understandable.

Overall, the new standards do a better job of defining the standards and adding specificity to their meanings. The CCS were, in general, more vague in their descriptions of the standard.

---

A2.SSE.D.14 - Appreciated the clearer language and specific expectations about logarithms

G.CP.B.7 - This standard lays out the expectation for understanding and applying the Addition Rule for probabilities. I feel like there should be a similar standard for the Multiplication Rule for probabilities, but it's sort of unclearly described in the conditional probability rules instead.

The geometry standards in general: "Theorems should include the following:" - does this mean those are the only theorems that should be included, or are there others and those are just examples?

**From:** [Almeta McMurtrey](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** SS 3rd grade  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 01, 2015 4:54:51 PM

---

Thanks for allowing the public to comment.

Having been an educator all my life I understand the massive transition in the 3rd grade classroom. That is why I speak against moving the 4th grade Missouri history down to 3rd grade. Moving all history down a grade would also mean that you have to be able to find a textbook company willing to revise texts for Missouri. Having worked in this industry those pages cost a lot of money hence the cost again of a complete textbook.

Children have transition in handwriting, math, reading, etc the third grade year. I see no need to add to a crowded schedule.

Thanks

Kay McMurtrey

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Melissa Jenson](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Social Studies GLE proposals  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 10:48:12 AM

---

To whom it may concern:

After analyzing the proposal presenting new social studies grade level expectations I have found them to be unrealistic for 2nd Grade students. The three main areas I find most disconcerting are content expectations, depth of knowledge requirements and unrealistic vocabulary conventions.

- The content expectations are not age appropriate for second grade students. Many of the new GLE's are being passed down from third grade standards and are not age appropriate expectations for 2nd grade.
- The depth of knowledge (DoK) for the new standards is much higher than the current standards. The current standards use words such as identify and explain, mostly DoK 1-2 requirements. The new standards are requiring skills such as analyze, use and explain, skills used more in DoK 3-4. Second grade students are not yet able to analyze information.
- The vocabulary knowledge required to implement these standards is incredibly difficult for 2nd grade students. They do not have the base of knowledge to understand the new vocabulary.

Additionally, the proposed GLE's would take a great deal more time and classroom resources to implement. We currently don't have those resources nor teachable time to implement these new standards.

Melissa Jenson

**From:** [Paulsen, Anna](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Social Studies GLE Proposal  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 9:27:31 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

After reviewing the proposed social studies grade level expectations, I have found them to be extremely unrealistic for my second grade students. There are major concerns regarding the content, vocabulary and the depth of knowledge in most of the GLE's.

\*\*The content is not age appropriate for my second grade students. Many GLE's are passed down from 3rd grade and 2nd graders aren't ready for them.

\*\*Vocabulary - The vocabulary is extremely difficult for the students especially when the students don't have any background knowledge to base it on.

\*\*DOK's - Many of the DOK's currently in 2nd grade are to identify and explain. The proposed ones are moved to analyze and explain. Second graders are unable to "analyze and explain" information they don't understand.

The proposed GLE's would take a great deal more time and resources to implement. We currently don't have those resources nor do we have time in the day to implement these.

Anna Paulsen  
Kirksville Primary School

### **Kirksville R-III School District Mail System**

**This mail system is for educational use only. All other use is forbidden.**

All contents of this system including email messages will remain the property of the Kirksville R-III School District. All users of this email system should consider its content public records. The Kirksville R-III School District reserves the right to monitor all users of this system and audit its content.

Email processed by Google mail.



**From:** [mking@kirksville.k12.mo.us](mailto:mking@kirksville.k12.mo.us)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Social Studies GLE Proposals  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 9:25:15 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been reviewing your new social studies grade level expectations. I have noticed many of the changes being unsuitable for our students at Kirksville Primary School. Here are some major concerns I see becoming an issue for our students and teachers:

- Vocabulary (students need a foundation and background knowledge of vocabulary before having to learn and apply)
- Content (while looking at the vertical alignment many skills are not developmentally appropriate and move at a faster pace than students will be able to obtain the information)
- Depth of Knowledge (going back to the vocabulary... there are many standards that are asking a high depth of knowledge concept where as our K-2 students need the foundational vocabulary first and understanding the meaning before applying the skills)

I hope you consider our concerns as we are working in the best interest of our students and what will be appropriate at this age level and be able to set a foundation of social studies vocabulary and understanding as they move through higher grade levels.

Thank you,  
Meghan King  
Academic Interventionist  
Kirksville Primary School

Sent from my iPad

--

\*Kirksville R-III School District Mail System\*

\*This mail system is for educational use only. All other use is forbidden.\*

All contents of this system including email messages will remain the property of the Kirksville R-III School District. All users of this email system should consider its content public records. The Kirksville R-III School District reserves the right to monitor all users of this system and audit its content.

Email processed by Google mail.

**From:** [Jeanette Westfall](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Liberty Public Schools Teacher Feedback on HB1490 Proposals  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 1:44:30 PM  
**Attachments:** [LPS HB1490 Feedback Nov 2015.docx](#)

---

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for considering Liberty teacher input in your curriculum review and alignment next steps. We will also send this submission as certified mail with the USPS.

With respect,

Dr. Jeanette Westfall  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development  
Liberty 53 School District  
8 Victory Lane  
Liberty, MO 64068  
(816) 736-5320

*Inspire. Invest. Innovate.*



Date: December 20, 2015

To: Missouri State Board of Education

Liberty Public Schools has worked collaboratively in grade level and content area teacher teams to review the HB1490 Work Groups submissions. We appreciate the opportunity to offer our feedback to the continued work on the K-12 curriculum standards.

Our teachers, staff, and community members have been encouraged to submit input on-line, but many of our instructional staff also felt the need to submit additional information as a collective. Their feedback and input is included with this letter.

Thank you for listening to our teachers and including their thinking in the next iteration of the curriculum to be presented to the Board of Education. We would be honored for you to consider our work. Additionally, if DESE creates any additional teacher work groups to refine the input from stakeholders, Liberty teachers are eager to help. Please let us know if we can be of any assistance.

With deep respect,

*/s/ Jeanette Westfall*

Jeanette Westfall, EdD  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Staff Development  
Liberty Public Schools #53

**Dr. Jeanette Westfall**

8 Victory Lane, Liberty, MO 64068  
Phone: 816.736.6486 E-Mail: [jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us](mailto:jwestfall@liberty.k12.mo.us)

## Liberty Public Schools #53 Instructional Staff Feedback by Content

### High School Science:

The level of rigor and organization of the proposed standards (Grades 6 – 12) is significantly improved from the science standards previously adopted by DESE. Whereas the current standards are very knowledge-based, the proposed standards require that students apply higher-level thinking in science coursework. The three-dimensional learning practices that form the basis of the middle and high school standards will cause a shift in thinking among educators. This should significantly improve science education in the state of Missouri and will serve to prepare our students for the future, as this design integrates Disciplinary Core Ideas, Cross-Cutting Concepts, and Science & Engineering Practices into a cohesive structure for science instruction.

One example of an improvement in the standards is the requirement that students “...apply concepts of statistics and probability...” As this is an essential skill in scientific thinking, it is very impressive to see this overtly stated in the proposed standards. For too long, we have considered some science courses as requiring “no math” when mathematical concepts are essential to ALL areas of science. Other standards include the phrase “construct an argument based on evidence...” which is another critical scientific literacy skill. Constructing arguments and applying mathematical concepts will lead to higher levels of performance by all students. Further, it is anticipated that the proposed standards will also allow more students across the state to have an authentic laboratory experience in which they have opportunities to collect, analyze and report data. The organization of the new Missouri Learning Standards will require the integration of science practices throughout the course.

In an effort to provide the most comprehensive and cohesive model for science instruction in Missouri, it is suggested that the proposed elementary science standards receive additional review by educators to ensure that they work in tandem with the proposed middle and secondary standards to provide for thorough and rigorous science education for Missouri students. We believe the committee has made a good start with the elementary standards but that they need some reorganization to meet the needs of students.

High School Social Studies: There are slight concerns over some of the testing implications due to the increased vagueness in the proposed standards for government. There is also a clear shift away from economics and a change in emphasis on the philosophers that influenced the development of constitutional governments that I don’t quite understand the reason for.

In world history, there is more of an emphasis on world history as opposed to European history, which I think is a good change. It is odd, however, why they choose to specifically focus on civilizations like the Gupta but then vaguely address East Asia and the Islamic Empires.

### *Government:*

Theme 1 Strand 4: want to make sure we are talking about “opportunity costs” and benefits, not “costs” and benefits. Can be a little confusing

Theme 2 Strand 2: might want to add primary sources for Enlightenment Thinkers on Social Contract. Hobbes, Montesquieu, Locke, & Rousseau were heavily featured before. Not sure why the shift away from them.

Theme 3: mentions “Seminal Supreme Court Cases” for primary sources they would recommend. Would like to know which cases the state feels are seminal.

### *US History:*

Theme 6: there is a concern that the history is too new to effectively “analyze” or “evaluate” and that lower levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy should dominate this theme

General questions:

Why aren’t Essential Questions provided by the state to guide instruction?

Possible primary and secondary sources: are these merely suggestions or are they tied to EOCs (particularly Government since this is the only one currently tested)? In other words, are those documents referenced in state tests?

### High School Mathematics:

#### Algebra 1

**Standard: A1.IF.C.7-** Graph functions, including simple piecewise defined functions (linear, simple quadratic and simple exponential), from their symbolic representation and show key features of the graph both by hand and by using technology.

**Proposed change:** Omit piecewise functions, or change to interpreting given piecewise functions (not graphing)

**Rationale:** Time would be better spent focusing on a deep understanding of the three types of functions. This is covered in upper level courses, and is very conceptually difficult for what is typically a freshmen level class.

#### **Standard: All of Data and Statistical Analysis Domain**

**Proposed change:** Significantly reduced or omitted from this course. (Keep scatterplots with linear relationships)

**Rationale:** Student have calculated measure of central tendency and represented data in different graphical representations in previous grades. Determining residuals from lines of fit, relative frequencies, and in depth analysis are far above what an average citizen would need to know to be able to make informed decisions, and several of these items are covered in Algebra 2. Putting so much focus on this unit uses considerable time that would be better spent on developing a deep understanding of Algebra, which is key for success in any future course.

**Standard: A1.REI.C.9def-** Solve mathematical and real-world problems involving quadratic equations in one variable. (methods: completing the square, quadratic formula, square roots, factoring; derive quadratic formula).

**Proposed change:** Omit completing the square, focus on solving by factoring and only simple quadratics ( $ax^2 + c = 0$ ) for solving.

**Rationale:** There is simply not enough time to realistically cover everything listed in the school year. Quadratics are covered extensively in Algebra 2. An introduction to basics is all that is necessary and feasible in Algebra 1. Derivation of the quadratic formula is very difficult, even for upper level students, and is too overwhelming for freshmen or younger students!

## Geometry

**Standard: G.SRT.A.1a** - Verify experimentally the properties of dilations given by a center and scale factor: A dilation takes a line not passing through the center of the dilation to a parallel line, and leaves a line passing through the center unchanged.

**Proposed change:** Omit

**Rationale:** A minute detail that does not impact students' understanding of properties of dilations given by a center and a scale factor.

**Standard: Probability Domain**

**Proposed change:** Omit

**Rationale:** It is typically covered in Algebra II. Not enough time to get to this before testing.

**Standard: G.S.RT.B.4** Prove theorems about triangles. (Theorems should include: a line parallel to one side of a triangle divides the other two side proportionally, and conversely, the Pythagorean Theorem proved using triangle similarity.

**Proposed change:** change prove theorems to use theorems

**Rationale:** It is more important to be able to use the concept correctly than spend time proving it.

## Algebra 2

**Standard: A2.APR.A.4** - Understand the Remainder Theorem: For a polynomial  $p(x)$  and a number  $a$ , the remainder on division of  $p(x)$  by  $(x-a)$  is  $p(a)$ , so  $p(a) = 0$  if and only if  $(x-a)$  is a factor of  $p(x)$ .

**Proposed Change:** Omit

**Rationale:** This is typically covered in Precalculus and College Algebra courses

**Standards: Data and Statistical Analysis Domain**

**Proposed Change:** Omit

**Rationale:** If the state test for juniors is going to be the ACT, data analysis and statistics are not tested on the ACT. As Algebra 2 is a course taken predominantly by juniors, we feel other standards should be considered, such as sequences and series and trigonometry. Sequences and patterns are commonly seen on the ACT, as well as simple trigonometry and Law of Sines and Law of Cosines. The Law of Sines and Law of Cosines are not included in the Geometry standards, but are tested on the ACT.

**Standards:** Review of Trigonometry, specifically addressing Law of Sines and Law of Cosines

**Proposed Change:** Add

**Rationale:** See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

**Standards:** Sequences and Patterns

**Proposed Change:** Add

**Rationale:** See above regarding the ACT Test. Copy and paste as necessary.

### Middle School Social Studies

Grade Levels Taught	Standards to Address	Proposed Changes
6th	The current standards that we address are what students are capable of grasping and understanding especially when 6th grade is really the first year they are exposed to concentrated social studies class.	At present the students level of engagement is high because of the standards and present curriculum that we teach.
6th		World History Theme 1 = 6th through 8th World History Theme 2 and 3 = 6th World History Theme 4 = 7th Geography = 6th through 8th
6th/7th	We would like to see more an emphasis on the World Geography Standards. We would also like to see the standards that correlate Japan, Mayans, Incan, African Empires emphasized in the curriculum.	We would like to see the World Geography standards incorporated with the World History standards.
6th/8th	MS World History Theme 1- all social studies classes Themes 2-3 = 6th Grade Themes 4-5 = 7th Grade MS Geography Themes 1-2 - all social studies classes MS American History - all themes = 8th grade	The MS World History course expectations are not realistic for a one year course. Many of the geography standards are integrated into history expectations. Split World History into 2 courses and integrate geography.
7th	Geography is substantially shorter than other strands. Is there a recommended timeline? Could Geography be blended in with the world and US history?	
7th	The World History Theme 1 and 2 standards need to be merged with the Geography Theme 1 and 2 standards as they are repetitive and should be combined.	I would like to see middle school world history and geography course expectations combined as the 6th and 7th grade courses are set up now. Having worked at another local district that did not combine the geography and world history course expectations, I observed the students only received an education on ancient Greece and Egypt.

### Middle School Mathematics:

After having some good discussion about this yesterday at our meeting, the teachers said that there was nothing that they thought needed to be changed and they actually liked some of the new wording in the standards better.

## Middle School Science:

### *Praise:*

- We appreciate the level of quality resources used to create these standards.
- We appreciate that performance expectations from A Framework for K-12 Science Education as that brings the standards from a DOK 1 and 2 to a more appropriate DOK 3 and 4.
- We noticed and appreciate that amount of content has been shortened while deepening the content that was kept.
- We are excited that the standards now include multiple opportunities to tie in engineering, technology, and relevant careers.

### *Concerns:*

- It is felt that the STATE will need to delineate where each learning standard is taught to ensure that transient students have a consistent education when moving rather than leaving it up to each district which standards should be taught at each grade. We are concerned that the standards do not currently include grade level delineation. Thinking about the ability of 11-14 year old children to cognitively grasp abstract concepts and then further analyze and apply, there are DOK expectations included in the standards that are clearly better aligned to 8th graders rather than 6th graders. We would encourage the committee not to take a “one size fits all” approach children in 6th–8th grades as the standards are currently presented. This will also help transient students to have a consistent experience at any Missouri school and not miss/repeat content.
- Amount of time to get through standards
- Amount of background knowledge to even address goal

### *MS Science Standard-by-Standard Feedback:*

- MSPS1-1. Develop models to describe the atomic composition of simple molecules and extended structures. (Organic chemistry, too high???)
- MSLS1-3. Develop an argument supported by evidence for how multicellular organisms are organized by varying levels of complexity; cells, tissue, organs, organ systems. (How can this be augmented?)
- MSLS4-4. Interpret graphical representations to support explanations of how natural selection may lead to increases and decreases of specific traits in populations over time. (Will data be provided to support teachers in teaching standards that required data to teach?)
- The word “model” implies a physical model. This either needs to be reworded or clarified to ensure teachers don’t go back to “cakes of cell models” as this does not teach a standard that asked to compare/contrast organelles.
- MS-PS3-1- The clarification statement does not clarify. It is very confusing!
- MS-PE3-3 How will this be assessed on a state level test?
- MS-PS3-4 and 5 I do not think these are 7th grade level questions. These are asking for some pretty high level thinking and implying lots of background knowledge in order to get to this high level.



- MS-ESS1-1 In the clarification it talks about models can be “physical, graphical or conceptual” how does that clarify anything? Perhaps it should define if the model is merely to reproduce the system or is the goal to explain the relationship between the Earth, Sun and Moon?
- MS-ESS1-2 Same as above.
- MS-ESS1-4 Is it really necessary to have this objective? Seems a bit out of place.
- MS-ESS1-5 I don’t think this fits at all with this thread. This is more geologic history and fossil evidence. Having this objective here leads me to think we are to talk about the formation of the universe which unless you have super current information (not text book) you will be wrong and teaching vastly outdated material. If the intention is to teach the Big Bang or other widely accepted and scientifically backed theories of the formation of the universe then that needs to be stated. Personally, I’m ok with it because having those conversations allows students to see that science is constantly evolving and hopefully this realization would eliminate the “science keeps changing their mind” thought.
- We question why the current Missouri Learning Standards for human body systems has been deleted. The Missouri state Health standards do not address some of the process introductions needed for students to be successful in biology. Specific examples include the process of nutrients passing through a semi-permeable membrane of a cell and the cell’s ability to turn that into energy.
- We are wondering if leaving out specific references to scientists of the past (I.e. Newton) was intentional and if so – why? We think that starting with a historical perspective gives students insight into the discoveries of these scientific laws and theories

### Elementary Social Studies:

#### **Kindergarten**

(Not in proposed standards) PPG.2.A Participate in a democratic decision making processes. \*I think it would be good for kids to have a chance to practice/learn what it means to vote. We do this every year on Election Day.

H.3.B.K.b Compare your family in the past and present. \* I don’t think kindergarteners have enough life perspective to do this.

The following are all new to K-I’m not sure K’s have enough life perspective for the depth of these! Not developmentally appropriate standards for 5-6 year olds in my opinion.

RI.6.A.K Describe cultural characteristics of your family and class members (e.g., language, celebrations, customs, holidays, artistic expression, food, dress, & traditions).

Ideas and beliefs of different cultures

RI.6.C.K Share stories related to your family cultural traditions and family lore. Cultural heritage and preservation

RI.6.D.4 Describe how you and your family remember and commemorate your cultural heritage. the world?

### **First Grade**

During 4th qtr. writer's workshop, 1st graders are supposed to write non-fiction pieces. They are no longer covering famous Americans during social studies in a way that is integrated between academic subjects. The famous Americans covered according the standards are related to holidays. This significantly decreases the number of famous Americans taught and therefore limits the number of famous Americans researched and written about.

We feel comfortable with the other items listed.

### **Second Grade**

Geographical Study

EG.5.A.2.a. Read and construct maps with title and key (regions of state, U.S., world)

I feel that at our level, being able to construct a map with title and key is developmentally appropriate. I think maybe being able to locate our state on a map is okay, but not sure on details of the world?

ES 5.B.2.a Name and locate regions of the world (continents, oceans, hemispheres) I think having students locate and name oceans and continents and not hemispheres.

I really think understanding relationships between and among regions is a little over 2nd grade. Maybe focusing in on Missouri alone and then able to build on it to compare regions in 3rd grade?

I think they have added a lot to what we already do and some seem to overlap as well.

### **Fourth Grade**

Agree

**GOVERNMENT**

Functions of governmental systems makes sense (state to federal and then to compare)

**HISTORY**

K - George Washington, Abe Lincoln

1st - MLK, Thomas Jefferson, Christopher Columbus

2nd - Inventors or Pioneers

3rd - Famous Missourians

4th - Significant individuals of 1800

5th - Significant individuals

1800-1940

**ECONOMICS**

Stayed the same

**GEOGRAPHY**

matches the government

**CULTURE STUDY**

New, but agree

**SOCIAL SCIENCE INQUIRY**

Same

QuestionableHISTORY

Civil War is introduced in third (gained 4th grades exact standard) then built in 5th. ?Why is this skipping 4th?

Why are the standards in history not introduced in chronological order?

Example, goes from Civil War(3rd), American Rev.(4th), back to Civil War(5th)

Student won't see the connections between time periods of time because events are taught out of chronological order

\*Concerned with topics being taught out of chronological order

Why do our history standards stop at 1940

Suggestion - Organize history standards chronologically

GEOGRAPHY

State level to national level

Elementary ELA:Writing Standards

Grade	Standard	Proposed Change (addition, deletion, modification in language, level or alignment)	Rationale for Change
5	Writing 1Db	Change two pages to one page.	Time doesn't allow for students to publish two pages. Very few pieces of our writing exceed five paragraphs.
5	Writing 3An	Bibliography - delete this	Intro/practice occurs with LMS; not age appropriate in classroom when the students are citing in their text.
5	Language 1Ab	Parts of speech - move to younger grade	Identify and use noun, pronoun, verb, adjective and adverb should occur earlier in elementary school
5	Language 1Bi	Apostrophes	Where did this previously occur?

Language Standards:

K	1Da	Give examples of digital tools	This would be helpful.
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean (spelling, reading, etc)
	1Bf	Use "reads" instead of "recognize" how to understand	The word recognize could cause confusion--what does it mean

## **Elementary Science:**

### **Kindergarten feedback:**

PS2B Observe that magnets cause some objects to move without touching them.

**Recommendation: Move to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade**

PS4A Compare and Contrast different sounds

Identify sounds and their source of vibration in everyday life.

Identify the ear as a receiver of vibrations that produce sounds.

**Recommendation: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

### **First Grade feedback:**

PS3A Compare the temperature of hot and cold objects using a simple thermometer.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy

PS4B Identify the source of energy causes an increase in temperature of an object.

**Recommendations: Move to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade**

### **Second Grade feedback:**

PS4-A Plan and conduct investigations to provide evidence that changes in vibration create change in sound.

Demonstrate that vibrating materials can create sounds and that sound can make materials vibrate.

Describe how the ear serves as a receiver of sounds.

Identify air, water and solids as media that sound travels through.

**Recommendations: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

### **Third Grade feedback:**

ESS1B Explain how the sun's position in the sky and the Earth's rotation affect the length and direction of shadows.

Observe and identify the moon is visible because it reflect light.

Describe how the sun, moon and stars appears to move slowly across the sky from east to west during the day and/or night due to the rotations of the Earth

Explain that the changing shape of the moon during positions of the earth, moon and sun rather than due to the Earth's shadow falling on the moon.

Identify the three things (light source, object and surface) necessary to produce a shadow.

Identify the Earth rotates on its axis once every 24 hours.

**Recommendation: Move to 1<sup>st</sup> grade**

PS1B Construct an argument with evidence that some changes caused by heating or cooling can be reversed and some cannot.

PS3B Identify sources of thermal energy (sun, stove, tire, body) that can cause solids to change to liquids and liquids to change to gas.

**Recommendation: Move to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade**

Fourth Grade feedback:

PS2A Make observation and or measurement of an objects motion to provide evidence that a pattern can be used to predict future motion

Plan and conduct an investigation to provide evidence of the effects of balanced and unbalanced forces on the motion of an object.

**Recommendation: Move to third grade**

PS2B Predict how changes in either the amount of force applied to an object or the mass of the object affects the motion (speed and direction) of the object

Observe the balanced forces do not affect an object's motion

Describe how unbalanced forces acting on an object changes its speed (faster/slower), direction of motion, or both.

**Recommendation: Move to third grade**

Fifth Grade feedback:

**No change recommendations**

**From:** [John Frazier](#)  
**To:** [Parson, Michael](#); [Crawford, Sandy](#); [1490Comments](#); [John Frazier](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed World History Course Expectations  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 1:42:52 PM

---

As someone who has enthusiastically taught world history for 17 years at Lebanon High school I'm very disappointed in the proposed world history course expectations. The expectations are very disjointed and will be difficult for students to follow. I'm fearful that my concerns and many teachers that do the day-to-day teaching of this curriculum will be simply ignored. I write this on behalf of the world history teachers of Lebanon High School who are very troubled by these new proposed course expectations. I can not fathom why ancient China is emphasized so heavily and there is no mention of China in the modern era. That is right, China is not even mentioned in the 19th and 20th centuries! There is also no mention of communism. A system students have a very difficult time understanding. If we do not teach communism, students will not have basis to understand this system as they get older. Moreover, the curriculum is way to broad; jumping from continent to continent with a confusing intended purpose. The curriculum will be impossible to teach in a school year. These are but a few of our concerns that I wanted to include in this e-mail. I'm very disappointed and disgusted that something this poorly put together will be used to teach students in Missouri. I could not in good conscious follow this curriculum leaving as it leaves out many important developments to our nation and to the modern world.

John Frazier

Sent from Lebanon High School, Lebanon R-III School District

**From:** [Michele Kearns](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Kuddos on the Social Studies Standards!  
**Date:** Friday, November 13, 2015 2:43:05 PM

---

As a former fourth grade teacher, and then a third grade teacher, I am so glad to see some social studies standards finally being taught in the lower grades. After teaching fourth grade for 14 years and being the first to expose students to social studies concepts, I am thrilled to see it being taught in third and even second grade now.

As a gifted teacher, I am very excited to see my younger students being taught more science as well, for this is an area I stress to my kids with STEM education!

Great job!

Michele Kearns  
Gifted Educator  
Festus Elementary/Intermediate Schools

**From:** [Franklin, Melia](#)  
**To:** [Coffman, Christopher](#)  
**Subject:** FW: DESE proposed work group standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 23, 2015 1:42:27 PM

---

Melia Franklin, Ed.D. | Director of English Language Arts and World Languages | Office of College and Career Readiness

P: 573-751-4898 | F: 573-526-0812 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov) | Follow me on Twitter @MeliaFranklin

---

**From:** Grupe, Dixie  
**Sent:** Friday, November 06, 2015 12:11 PM  
**To:** 'Carrie Homan'  
**Cc:** Boeckmann (DESE), Julie; Franklin, Melia; Grupe, Dixie  
**Subject:** RE: DESE proposed work group standards

Hi Carrie,

Thanks for your insightful observations and comments; we are in the process of compiling public input and I will forward your comments and concerns to the appropriate sources. Social Studies is such an important part of our work as teachers, and I really appreciate your willingness to clearly articulate your concerns. My husband's family is from Cole Camp, so I know what great people call that little place home!

Thanks,  
Dixie

---

**From:** Carrie Homan [<mailto:HomanC@colecamp.k12.mo.us>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 02, 2015 2:14 PM  
**To:** Grupe, Dixie  
**Subject:** DESE proposed work group standards

Dixie –

After analyzing the standards from the HB1490 social studies work group, I hope you could clear up a concern/question I have. There seems to be no government standards for middle school. It appears that the former government middle school standards were replaced by geography standards. I think that both are extremely important, but I believe that there is a requirement in the state constitution for middle school government instruction. Is that being interpreted differently by the work group?

Section 170.011.1

Regular courses of instruction in the Constitution of the United States and of the state of Missouri and in American history and institutions shall be given in all public and private schools in the state of Missouri, except privately operated trade schools, and **shall begin not later than the seventh grade** and continue in high school to an extent determined by the state commissioner of



education, and shall continue in college and university courses to an extent determined by the state commissioner of higher education.

Sincerely  
Carrie Homan  
Cole Camp R-I  
Social Studies department chair

**From:** [Franklin, Melia](#)  
**To:** ["Zach Kosark"](#)  
**Cc:** [Boeckmann \(DESE\), Julie](#); [Grupe, Dixie](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 6-12 Social Studies Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:57:32 AM

---

Zach,

As we begin the process of going through the documents submitted to us, we truly value comments like yours. The Social Studies Director, Dixie Grupe, is carbon copied on this email and she can act upon your comments.

Thank you,

Melia

Melia Franklin, Ed.D. | Director of English Language Arts and World Languages | Office of College and Career Readiness

P: 573-751-4898 | F: 573-526-0812 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov) | Follow me on Twitter @MeliaFranklin

---

**From:** Zach Kosark [mailto:[ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us](mailto:ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:48 AM  
**To:** Franklin, Melia  
**Cc:** Boeckmann (DESE), Julie; Grupe, Dixie  
**Subject:** Re: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

Thank you for your quick response.

I think my confusion is just in the fact that in the introduction document its states "Standards are organized by grade level and grouped by theme. This allows the reader to look at a single grade level span at a time." however the only grouping by grade level is "middle school" or "high school" with no mention of grade for individual classes. The introduction document then goes on to state "Consider the following 8th grade standard..." when showing how to unpack the standards, the problem with this is there is no such thing as an "8th Grade standard" in any document posted. I can assume they are meaning the Middle School American History document as that is typically a course taught to 8th graders, but when it is stated as an 8th grade standard it suggests you can find "8th grade standards" which I can't seem to find.

I know this might not be an issues or concern you are needed to deal with but hopefully my concern can be passed along. Personally I think this adds to a problem of course consistency, especially in the middle grades across districts in the state. There is a clear construct of what the social studies focus of each grade level should be in grades K-5, but then no guidance with what specific topics should be dealt with during the 6th grade year, 7th grade year, or 8th grade year.

Again, thank you for your quick response. I appreciate any information you have on anything I have brought up.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

On Oct 29, 2015, at 9:04 AM, Franklin, Melia <[Melia.Franklin@dese.mo.gov](mailto:Melia.Franklin@dese.mo.gov)> wrote:

Hello, Zach,

I spoke with the 6-12 Social Studies workgroup lead. He offered this explanation:

...these documents are quite different from current standards. Key changes are fully explained in the Introduction to the Standards document. Most important of these is the orientation of the document which clearly organizes course-level standards together. The documents address the courses required of students in Missouri. This approach is consistent with most state standards and was done intentionally to transform lists of unrelated ideas into clear and usable expectations.

I hope you find this explanation helpful.

Thanks,  
Melia

Melia Franklin, Ed.D. | Director of English Language Arts and World Languages |  
Office of College and Career Readiness  
P: 573-751-4898 | F: 573-526-0812 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov) | Follow me on Twitter  
@MeliaFranklin

-----Original Message-----

From: Boeckmann (DESE), Julie  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:41 AM  
To: Franklin, Melia  
Subject: FW: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

FYI:

Julie Boeckmann | Communications Technician | Communications | 573.751.3469  
| [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Zach Kosark [<mailto:ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us>]  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:17 AM  
To: 1490Comments  
Subject: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

Is there no document for 6-12 proposed social studies standards? It seems to be the only one missing and there are only course expectations for specific classes.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

**From:** [Zach Kosark](#)  
**To:** [Franklin, Melia](#)  
**Cc:** [Boeckmann \(DESE\), Julie](#); [Grupe, Dixie](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 6-12 Social Studies Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:48:16 AM

---

Thank you for your quick response.

I think my confusion is just in the fact that in the introduction document it states "Standards are organized by grade level and grouped by theme. This allows the reader to look at a single grade level span at a time" however the only grouping by grade level is "middle school" or "high school" with no mention of grade for individual classes. The introduction document then goes on to state "Consider the following 8th grade standard..." when showing how to unpack the standards, the problem with this is there is no such thing as an "8th Grade standard" in any document posted. I can assume they are meaning the Middle School American History document as that is typically a course taught to 8th graders, but when it is stated as an 8th grade standard it suggests you can find "8th grade standards" which I can't seem to find.

I know this might not be an issue or concern you are needed to deal with but hopefully my concern can be passed along. Personally I think this adds to a problem of course consistency, especially in the middle grades across districts in the state. There is a clear construct of what the social studies focus of each grade level should be in grades K-5, but then no guidance with what specific topics should be dealt with during the 6th grade year, 7th grade year, or 8th grade year.

Again, thank you for your quick response. I appreciate any information you have on anything I have brought up.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

On Oct 29, 2015, at 9:04 AM, Franklin, Melia <[Melia.Franklin@dese.mo.gov](mailto:Melia.Franklin@dese.mo.gov)> wrote:

Hello, Zach,

I spoke with the 6-12 Social Studies workgroup lead. He offered this explanation:

...these documents are quite different from current standards. Key changes are fully explained in the Introduction to the Standards document. Most important of these is the orientation of the document which clearly organizes course-level standards together. The documents address the courses required of students in Missouri. This approach is consistent with most state standards and was done intentionally to transform lists of unrelated ideas into clear and usable expectations.

I hope you find this explanation helpful.

Thanks,  
Melia

Melia Franklin, Ed.D. | Director of English Language Arts and World Languages |

Office of College and Career Readiness  
P: 573-751-4898 | F: 573-526-0812 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov) | Follow me on Twitter  
@MeliaFranklin

-----Original Message-----

From: Boeckmann (DESE), Julie  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:41 AM  
To: Franklin, Melia  
Subject: FW: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

FYI:

Julie Boeckmann | Communications Technician | Communications | 573.751.3469  
| [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Zach Kosark [<mailto:ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us>]  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:17 AM  
To: 1490Comments  
Subject: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

Is there no document for 6-12 proposed social studies standards? It seems to be the only one missing and there are only course expectations for specific classes.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

**From:** [Franklin, Melia](#)  
**To:** [Boeckmann \(DESE\), Julie](#)  
**Cc:** "[ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us](mailto:ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us)"; [Grupe, Dixie](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 6-12 Social Studies Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:04:43 AM

---

Hello, Zach,

I spoke with the 6-12 Social Studies workgroup lead. He offered this explanation:

...these documents are quite different from current standards. Key changes are fully explained in the Introduction to the Standards document. Most important of these is the orientation of the document which clearly organizes course-level standards together. The documents address the courses required of students in Missouri. This approach is consistent with most state standards and was done intentionally to transform lists of unrelated ideas into clear and usable expectations.

I hope you find this explanation helpful.

Thanks,  
Melia

Melia Franklin, Ed.D. | Director of English Language Arts and World Languages | Office of College and Career Readiness  
P: 573-751-4898 | F: 573-526-0812 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov) | Follow me on Twitter @MeliaFranklin

-----Original Message-----

From: Boeckmann (DESE), Julie  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:41 AM  
To: Franklin, Melia  
Subject: FW: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

FYI:

Julie Boeckmann | Communications Technician | Communications | 573.751.3469 | [dese.mo.gov](http://dese.mo.gov)

-----Original Message-----

From: Zach Kosark [<mailto:ZKosark@waynesville.k12.mo.us>]  
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:17 AM  
To: 1490Comments  
Subject: 6-12 Social Studies Standards

Is there no document for 6-12 proposed social studies standards? It seems to be the only one missing and there are only course expectations for specific classes.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

**From:** [Zach Kosark](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** 6-12 Social Studies Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:17:08 AM

---

Is there no document for 6-12 proposed social studies standards? It seems to be the only one missing and there are only course expectations for specific classes.

Zach Kosark  
Waynesville Middle School  
7th Grade Red Team: World Studies

**From:** [Robert Prichard](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** HB 1490  
**Date:** Thursday, October 22, 2015 10:49:37 PM

---

To The Committee,

Thank You for the chance to address the academic standards in Social Studies. I am a 19 year veteran teacher and department chair, and I wonder at the role of these new standards in my curriculum. Will they replace the CLE/GLE which replaced the Show Me Standards? It seems just as we get our bearings as to what is expected, the target is moved once again. At some point there must be a reduction in interference from Jefferson City into our classrooms. As well-meaning as it is, a constant top down directive is frustrating to those of us still in the classroom. A 415 page Evaluation Model from DESE to set the standards of how to teach, is now joined by a new set of standards of what to teach. I understand the directive from the General Assembly and wish to thank the members for their time served.

Respectfully,  
Robert Prichard, II



---

**From:** Tamatha Steinwachs [<mailto:TSteinwachs@BSSD.NET>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2015 1:39 PM

**To:** DESE Communications

**Subject:** Social Studies Middle School

I would like to propose in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade instead of Geography in 7<sup>th</sup> grade to start American History curriculum in 7<sup>th</sup> grade and work forward into 8<sup>th</sup> grade. I believe much of the geography could also be incorporated in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade Ancient Civilizations big idea study.

Thank you,  
Tammy Steinwachs

---

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This correspondence and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient(s), please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the original

**From:** [Parkhurst, Jodie](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** comments on social studies standards  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 13, 2015 12:30:13 PM

---

While reading through the social studies standards I have great concern that they are not developmentally appropriate for the age groups. You have switched the unit of study all about the state of Missouri to third grade. This is not curriculum that will be appropriate for them to accomplish. Also all the resources that will be available will be at the fourth grade level. Is the state going to be developing resources that will be grade level appropriate? I believe that the social studies standards need to be reviewed.

--

Jodie Parkhurst-I have been a third grade teacher in the state of Missouri for the last 12 years.

*This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of the East Buchanan C-1 School District. They are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.*